



Hopf response
V.Bacon
3/11/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

SHIFF et al.

Application No. 09/006,999

Filed: January 14, 1998

For: APPARATUS FOR THE
SEPARATION OF CYSTIC
PARASITE FORMS FROM
WATER

Appeal No. 2001-1490

Art Unit: 2856

Examiner: M. Cygan

Atty. Docket No. 2240-171353

Customer No.



26694

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action issued December 4, 2002, please consider the following remarks. It is not believed that any fee is due in the application, but should any fee be necessary for the consideration of this paper, please charge deposit account no. 22-0261 and notify the undersigned.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10-12 are pending. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected as being anticipated by Mudambi (Proceed. 26th Conf. Great Lakes Res.). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The device of Mudambi and Hassett was developed to remove extraneous particles from water sample prior to the determination of the organic contaminant Mirex, which was present in picogram quantities. The procedure and principle are completely different from the concept of the present invention, which includes a filtration process within the centrifuge and is concerned with larger particulate matter. The device used by Mudambi and Hassett was, in fact, a milk separating machine made by Alfa-Laval. After passage through the separator, the particle-free water was then passed through a column

RECEIVED
MAR -5 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800